

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 have initially been canceled, claims 21 and 22 has been amended and claim 28 has been added. Claims 21 to 28 are now active in this application.

An inventive feature of the present application as claimed resides in the fact that electrical terminals for connection are disposed on the edge surfaces as opposed to the top and bottom surfaces which are referred to as major surfaces. The term "major" is used because it refers to the larger surfaces where as the edge surfaces are much smaller and are therefore "minor" surfaces. The claims require that connection be made to a circuit board at the edge of the package rather than from a major surface as has been done in the prior art. In view of the above explanation, the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Holman (U.S. 6,005,776). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 requires, among other features, providing an integrated circuit package having a pair of opposing major surfaces and at least one edge surface disposed between the opposing major surfaces, one of the at least one edge surface having at least one electrical terminal disposed thereon. Nowhere does Holman teach or suggest an integrated circuit package having an electrical terminal on an edge surface as opposed to one of the major surfaces.

Claim 21 further requires the step of electrically connecting the at least one electrical terminal on the at least one edge surface of the integrated circuit package to the top surface of the printed circuit board. Again, no such step is anywhere taught or suggested by Holman.

Claims 22 to 28 depend from claim 21 and therefore define patentably over Holman for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 21.

In addition, claim 22 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of electrically and perpendicularly connecting at least two integrated circuit packages to the circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

Claim 23 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of disposing a solder ball between the side surface terminal of the integrated circuit package and the top of the circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

Claim 24 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of disposing solder columns between the integrated circuit and the top of the circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

Claim 25 further limits claim 21 by requiring the step of integrally attaching at least three tabs to said circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

Claim 26 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the integrated circuit package be further defined as being connected in a substantially perpendicular manner to the circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.


Claim 27 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the integrated circuit package be further defined as being connected at an angle between 30 and 90 degrees to the circuit board. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

Claim 28 further limits claim 21 by requiring that the at least one edge surface is four edge surfaces, each of the four edge surfaces disposed between the major surfaces to

form a closed package with the major surfaces. No such combination is taught or suggested by Holman.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jay M. Cantor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jay M. Cantor
Reg. No. 19906
(202) 639-7713